Remarks

Examiner Lamarre is thanked for the Office Action of September 7, 2004. Claims 1-8, 11-13, 16-18, 21-27 and 29-34 have been rejected under section 102 in view of the Koo reference, U.S. Patent 5,940,070, and claims 9-10, 14-15, 19-20 and 28 have been rejected under section 103 in view of the Koo and Limberg references, U.S. Patents 5,940,070 and 5,555,024 respectively. In response to this action, claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21 and 25 have been amended. Claims 2 and 28 have also been amended to more positively recite features of the invention and avoid any ambiguities.

Regarding the Examiner's objection to paragraph [28] containing unclear language, "comparing a packet length to a checksum error", Applicants maintain that this language refers to conventional techniques of error correction methods wherein specific values of data (such as packet length) are compared to other data values to ensure that the data has been transmitted/received without error. Applicants further believe that the specification's teachings and description of these comparisons of error detection data are correct and appropriate to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The instant invention relates to combining video data and other auxiliary data into a composite data signal using a control signal. By determining the pulse duration of the control signal, the composite data signal may be separated into the correct video and auxiliary data signals. The present invention goes beyond conventional data combining techniques as the control pulse may be of a variable length, thereby allowing for variable video and auxiliary data signals to be transmitted. See page 13 of the specification that details the pulse length determination and the further processing in accordance with the detected pulse durations.

Regarding the rejection of the claims 1-8, 11-13, 16-18, 21-27 and 29-34 in view of the Koo reference, applicants have amended the claims 1, 6, 11, 16 and 25 to positively recite that the composite data signal (that is comprised of the video and audio data) is formed or separated based on the duration of the control signal. This feature is clearly not contained in the Koo reference.

The Koo reference merely places audio data between video data pulses. In these teachings, *the duration of the audio and video pulses always remains constant.* There is no structure or teaching in the Koo reference of varying the pulse durations or processing the signals based on their detected pulse duration. There is also no mention of control signals or de-multiplexing the signals based on the received pulse durations as recited.

Regarding claim 24, there is no mention in the Office Action of the language relating to "the packet forming logic". This subject matter is also not contained in the disclosure of Koo. Therefore the subject matter of claim 24 has been incorporated into independent claim 21.

Claims 29 and 33 also explicitly recite features such as "data packets" and "pulse durations", however these features are not addressed in the Office Action. Again there is no mention of these features in Koo.

Regarding the rejection of claims 9-10, 14-15, 19-20 in view of the Koo and Limberg references, the Limberg reference also does make up for the deficiencies of Koo and does not teach the features of processing a composite data signal based on the duration of a control signal. Further, the Office Action points to column 3, lines 23+ of Limberg to teach error correction techniques, however this portion of text in Limberg is referring to another related patent application and not the actual invention of Limberg. Therefore, Applicants assert that these claims define over the proposed combination of Koo and Limberg and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Therefore Applicants now respectfully submit that for at least the reasons above, the claims define over the Koo and Limberg references.

Applicant respectfully submits that in light of the amendments and remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned Agent if any issues remain.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP

Date: March 7, 2005

Steven S. Kelley
Registration No. 43,449

Correspondence Address:
Customer No. 22918
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 2168
Menlo Park, CA 94025
Telephone: (202) 434-1630
Facsimile: (202) 434-1690